

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRENDA K. SANDERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 23-cv-10778
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

MICHIGAN ATTORNEY
DISCIPLINE BOARD,

Defendant.

**ORDER (1) ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION OF REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF No. 34), (2) GRANTING DEFENDANT’S
MOTION TO DISMISS (ECF No. 20), AND (3) DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
MOTION TO AMEND CASE CAPTION AND ADD INDIVIDUAL PARTY
DEFENDANTS (ECF No. 27)**

In this action, Plaintiff Brenda Sanders brings claims against Defendant Michigan Attorney Discipline Board (the “Board”) arising out of the decision to place her law license on inactive status. (*See* Am. Compl., ECF No. 12.) On September 20, 2023, the Board moved to dismiss Sanders’ claims. (*See* Mot. to Dismiss, ECF No. 20.) Sanders has also filed her own motion to amend the case caption and for leave to name additional Defendants. (*See* Sanders Mot., ECF No. 27.)

Both motions were referred to the assigned Magistrate Judge. On February 21, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation in which she recommended that the Court grant the Board's motion and deny Sanders' motion (the "R&R"). (*See* R&R, ECF No. 34.) At the conclusion of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge informed that the parties that if they wanted to object to her recommendations, they needed to file specific objections with the Court within fourteen days. (*See id.*, PageID.203-204.) On March 6, 2024, Sanders filed a motion for additional time to file her objections. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 35.) The Court granted that motion and ordered Sanders to file her objections by no later than March 26, 2024. (*See* Order, ECF No. 36.)

Despite the Court extending the time for Sanders to file objections to the R&R, as of the date of this order, Sanders has not filed any objections with the Court. Nor has she contacted the Court to ask for additional time to file her objections. The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). *See also Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, (6th Cir. 1987) (explaining that where party fails to file "timely objections" to report and recommendation, court may accept that recommendation "without expressing any view on the merits of the magistrate's conclusions"). Likewise, the failure to file objections to an R&R waives any further right to appeal.

See Howard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs., 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991);
Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers Local 231, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, because Sanders has failed to file any objections to the R&R, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition of the pending motions is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that (1) the Board's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 20) is **GRANTED** and (2) Sanders' motion to amend the case caption and to name additional Defendants (ECF No. 27) is **DENIED**.

This action is **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: May 22, 2024

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on May 22, 2024, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126